

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above-identified application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on April 7, 2008. By the present amendment, claims 1-12 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 2, 3, and 4 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. In view of the amendments above and the remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term objected to, namely, "selectively fixing" has been replaced by "by an interconnecting feature that allows for selective fixing of", now appearing in amended claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the structure is positively recited by the amendment of claim 1. Claims 2-12, which depend from claim 1, were also rejected for the same reason. In view of the amendment of claim 1 herein, the withdrawal of rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner argued that the recitation "the locking leg portion" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 2 has been amended to depend from claim 10, which recites "the first and second fastener portions have a locking leg portion," to provide the necessary antecedent basis. Applicant now believes that claim 1

Application Serial No. 10/516,434
Amendment dated April 24, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed April 7, 2008
Docket: 2846 (203-3325 PCT US)

as amended herein overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.


Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner argued that the recitation "a locking leg portion" is a double inclusion. Claims 2 and 4, which both recite "locking leg portion", have been amended to depend from claim 10. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 4 were objected to as being identical. Claim 3 has been rewritten to claim another feature of the present disclosure. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview may facilitate resolution of any outstanding issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

An early and favorable response on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Francesco Sardone
Reg. No.: 47,918
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Carter, DeLuca, Farrell & Schmidt, LLP
445 Broad Hollow Road - Suite 225
Melville, New York 11747
Tel.: (631) 501-5700
Fax: (631) 501-3526